

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 22, 2008. Claims 1, 8 and 10 are pending in the application, all of which are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0021905 (Holmstead) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,467 (Morita). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant submits that the foregoing amendments to the claims have addressed the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that acquires a plurality of image data from a server device via a network and controls a printer to print a print job generated from the plurality of image data. The apparatus includes first list creation means for creating a first list of identification information for the plurality of image data, which are designated to be printed and to be acquired from the server device; image storage means for storing the plurality of image data, which have already been designated to be printed and acquired from the server device during previous rounds of printing; second list creation means for creating a second list of identification information for the plurality of image data which have been previously printed; comparison means for comparing the first list and the second; deletion means for deleting the image data stored in the image storage means that is not included in the first list but in the second list, based on a result of comparing by the comparison means; and updating means for updating the second list on the first

list, after acquiring from the server device the image data that is not included in the second list but in the first list.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Holmstead and Morita, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the apparatus of Claim 1. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features creating a first list of identification information for a plurality of image data, which are designated to be printed and to be acquired from a server device, storing the plurality of image data, which have already been designated to be printed and acquired from the server device during previous rounds of printing, creating a second list of identification information for the plurality of image data which have been previously printed, comparing the first list and the second list, deleting the stored image data that is not included in the first list but in the second list, and updating the second list on the first list, after acquiring from the server device the image data that is not included in the second list but in the first list.

In contrast, Holmstead discloses checking whether or not an instructed print job is already stored in a local computer, and, if not, downloading the print job from a remote site. However, in Holmstead, every downloaded print job remains stored in memory or is temporarily held for a specific period of time. (See Holmstead, element 414 in Fig. 4 and element 814 in Fig. 8). Therefore, an apparatus in accordance with Holmstead stores unnecessary print jobs when printing a number of print jobs.

Furthermore, Morita discloses using two distinct storage devices within a single information processing apparatus wherein the storage devices have differing access times, and reducing file access time is by utilizing the faster second storage device when reading data stored in the slower storage device (See Morita, Figs. 5 to 8). This is a method which takes advantage

of the differing properties of two storage devices, namely RAM and a HDD. However, the apparatus of Claim 1 does not rely on differences in access times of different storage media. Therefore, the methods for reducing time used for processing in Morita and the apparatus of Claim 1, namely access time and download time, respectively, are completely different in nature.

Moreover, the faster storage device in Morita merely contains a list, but does not contain the actual data required for printing (See Morita, Figs. 5 to 8). Additionally, the method of Morita of comparing FATs of two storage devices is merely for the purpose of updating the FAT in a HDD, and is not used in the determination of data to be downloaded. Lastly, Morita aims to reduce file access time within a single device and is unrelated to determination of files to be downloaded.

The apparatus of Claim 1, on the other hand, reduces download time by creating two lists of image data and comparing the two lists in order to eliminate redundant downloading of files that already exist in a local memory. Hence, the apparatus of Claim 1 includes a feature undisclosed in Morita, namely using the result of comparing two lists to determine which files are to be downloaded.

Therefore, even if Holmstead and Morita were combined, which Applicant does not concede is permissible, the combination would still not disclose or suggest creating two lists, comparing the two lists in order to eliminate redundant downloading, whereby the time required for acquiring image data to be printed is reduced.

In light of the deficiencies of Holmstead and Morita as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 8 and 10 are directed to a computer-readable storage medium and a method, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 8 and 10 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS_WS 2113425v1